EXHIBIT 16

EXHIBIT 16

Page 1 1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 4 5 In the Matter of: 6 TRANSMAR COMMODITY GROUP, Case No. 16-13625-jlg 7 8 LTD., 9 10 Debtor. 11 12 13 14 United States Bankruptcy Court 15 One Bowling Green 16 New York, New York 17 18 June 9, 2017 19 11:12 a.m. 20 21 22 23 BEFORE: 24 HON JAMES L. GARRITY 25 U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Page 2 1 Hearing re: Application for FRBP 2004 Examination Motion 2 for an Order Pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure Authorizing ABN AMRO Capital USA LLC to 3 Issue a Subpoena for the Further Production of Documents 4 5 from and the Oral Examination of AMERRA Capital Management 6 LLC, by Nancy Obler (Doc #255) 7 8 Hearing re: Declaration of Kenneth Pasquale in Support of 9 Motion for an Order Pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal 10 Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure Authorizing ABN AMRO Capital 11 USA LLC to Issue a Subpoena for the Further Production of 12 Documents from and the Oral Examination of AMERRA Capital 13 Management LLC, by Nancy Obler (Doc # 256) 14 15 Hearing re: Objection of AMERRA Capital Management LLC to 16 the Motion for an Order Pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal 17 Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure Authorizing ABN AMRO Capital 18 USA LLC to Issue a Subpoena for the Further Production of 19 Documents from and the Oral Examination of AMERRA Capital 20 Management LLC, by Nancy Obler (Doc # 273) 21 22 Hearing re: Affidavit of John G. Hutchinson filed by John 23 C. Hutchinson on behalf of AMERRA Capital Management LLC 24 25 Hearing re: Reply to Motion ABN AMRO Capital USA LLCs Reply

Page 3 in Further Support of its Motion for an Order Pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure Authorizing ABN AMRO to Issue a Subpoena for the Further Production of Document from the Oral Examination of AMERRA Capital Management LLC, by Nancy Obler (Doc 289) Transcribed by: Dawn South

Page 4 1 APPEARANCES: 2 RIKER, DANZIG, SCHERER, HYLAND, PERRETTI, LLP 3 Attorney for the Debtor 4 Headquarters Plaza 5 One Speedwell Avenue Morristown, NJ 07962 6 7 8 BY: JOSEPH L. SCHWARTZ, ESQ. 9 KLESTADT, WINTERS, JURELLER, SOUTHARD & STEVENS, LLP 10 11 Attorney for the Debtor 12 200 West 41st Street, 17th Floor 13 New York, NY 10036 14 15 BY: JOSEPH C. CORNEAU, ESQ. 16 17 STROOCK, STROOCK & LAVAN, LLP 18 Attorney for ABN AMRO 19 180 Maiden Lane 20 New York, NY 10038 21 22 ANDREW DENATALE, ESQ. BY: 23 24 25

Г	Py 5 01 32	
		Page 5
1	SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP	
2	Attorneys for AMERRA	
3	787 Seventh Avenue	
4	New York, NY 10019	
5		
6	BY: LEE S. ATTANASIO, ESQ.	
7	JOHN G. HUTCHINSON, ESQ.	
8		
9	Tarter Krinsky & Drogin	
10	Attorney for the Committee	
11	1350 Broadway	
12	New York, NY 10018	
13		
14	BY: ROCCO A. CAVALIERE, ESQ.	
15		
16	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	
17	Attorney for the U.S. Trustee	
18	U.S. Federal Office Building	
19	201 Varick Street	
20	Suite 1006	
21	New York, NY 10014	
22		
23	BY: ANDREW D. VELEZ-RIVERA, ESQ.	
24		
25		

Page 6 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. 3 (A chorus of good morning) THE COURT: This is Transmar Commodity Group Ltd., 5 case number 16-13625. This is the adjourned hearing on the 6 motion that was filed by ABN AMRO seeking Rule 2004 7 discovery. 8 I'm not -- don't need to take appearances. 9 thank you all for being here, and we adjourned this so that 10 -- the argument was on May 31st -- we adjourned it to give 11 the Court a little bit more time to consider the arguments, 12 and I'm now prepared to rule. 13 The matter before the Court is the motion of ABN 14 AMRO Capital USA LLC, I'll refer to it as ABN AMRO, as 15 administrative agent and collateral agent for itself and 16 other secured lenders, I'll refer to as the lenders, under 17 the amended and restated credit agreement dated as of 18 February 26th, 2016, as amended, for the entry of an order 19 pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy 20 Procedure authorizing ABN AMRO to issue a subpoena for the production of certain documents from and for oral 21 22 examination of Amerra Capital Management LLC, which I'll 23 refer to as Amerra, by Nancy Obler, a managing director. See ECF document No. 255. 24 25 This is the second time that ABN AMRO has sought

Rule 2004 discovery from Amerra.

At the outset of these cases and by ex parte motion dated January 17, 2017, which I'll refer to as the first Rule 2004 motion, which is at ECF No. 71, it sought such discovery with respect to, among other things -- that's all right -- transactions among Amerra and the debtor, Transmar Commodity Group Ltd., or Transmar, or Transmar's affiliate, Euromar Commodity GmbH, or Euromar.

Amerra objected to the discovery; however, after several conferences among ABN AMRO, Amerra, and the Court, Amerra agreed to produce to ABN AMRO documents "dating from January 1, 2016 to the present sufficient to evidence the facts, terms, and conditions or transactions between or among Amerra, Euromar, and/or the debtor, provided that Amerra was a party to some part of the transaction or a related transaction involving the debtor or Euromar and in fact possesses additional documents."

See the order pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure authorizing ABN AMRO to issue subpoenas to Amerra dated February 14, 2017. That's ECF document No. 125. I'll refer to that as the Amerra Rule 2004 order.

Amerra objected to ABN AMRO obtaining deposition discovery on those matters and none was ordered.

In support of the motion, and among other things,

ABN AMRO asserts that through discovery obtained from the debtors it is learned that in the months leading up to the commencement of the Chapter 11 cases Ms. Obler played an active role in advising the debtor's management team.

It contends that upon learning of that role its counsel requested that Amerra voluntarily produce additional documents beyond the scope of the Amerra Rule 2004 order and voluntarily produce Ms. Obler for examination under oath, but that Amerra refused that request. See the motion at paragraph 4.

ABN AMRO asserts that there is an urgent need for the Court to grant the motion. It maintains that it requires what it characterizes as limited additional documents from Amerra and Ms. Obler's oral examination in order advance its investigation of the debtor's business and final affairs. Motion at 17.

To that end it maintains that it requested -- that the requested discovery will allow it to continue to (A), investigate the debtor's recordkeeping processes and operations, including, but not limited to, transactions with its affiliates and certain third parties; (B), investigate the facts, circumstances, and events that resulted in the disappearance of hundreds of millions of dollars in collateral value and other property of the debtor's estate reflected in the borrowing of base reports; and (C),

determining whether the lenders, individually, and the debtor's creditors, generally, have viable claims against any parties as a result of the facts and circumstances that resulted in this bankruptcy case. See the motion at 18.

Moreover, ABN AMRO asserts that its investigation and any facts and information discovered as a result thereof with inure to the benefit of the debtor's estate and its creditors and will not be duplicative of any investigation conducted by the creditors' committee. See the motion at 19.

Amerra opposes the motion. See the Amerra objection referred to, that is the objection ECF document No. 273.

And ABN AMRO submitted a reply to the objection. See ECF document No. 293.

Amerra maintains that there's nothing new to ABN AMRO about Amerra's alleged special relationship with the debtor, because as early as January 24th, 2017 ABN AMRO contended that Amerra has a "unique and uniquely close" relationship with Euromar and Transmar and on that basis sought wide ranging discovery, including emails. See the objection at paragraph 4.

Moreover, it asserts that although the motion portrays ABN AMRO's new discovery demands as a means to locate hundreds of millions of dollars in collateral that

has disappeared, it made the same exact allegations in support of the first Rule 2004 motion. See the objection at 4.

To that end it maintains that the fundamental basis of the first Rule 2004 motion was that Amerra's transactions with Euromar and Transmar were somehow improper and that documentation would show that Amerra was extracting funds from the debtor. See the objection at 25.

It notes that in support of the first Rule 2004 motion ABN AMRO asserted that "whether and to what extent Amerra benefited at the expense of the lenders and the debtor's estate generally as a result of the debtor's transactions and relationship with Euromar is ripe for investigation." That's the objection at 25 citing the first Rule 2004 motion at paragraph 18.

Amerra labels this as "ABN's grand conspiracy theory." The objection at 31.

It maintains that this is the same basis on which ABN AMRO is seeking discovery in this motion, thus as a preliminary matter Amerra argues that the motion should be denied because it amounts to an attempted bait and switch in that ABN AMRO has brought no new information forward and nonetheless is seeking discovery beyond the scope of that authorized in the Amerra Rule 2004 order. See the objection at paragraph 4.

Amerra asserts that in response to the Amerra Rule 2004 order it provided documents that were meticulously organized by transaction, including each leg of 48 separate cocoa transactions and was produced in its entirety by April 11, 2017.

Although Amerra acknowledges that the Amerra Rule 2004 order preserved ABN AMRO's right to seek further Rule 2004 discovery from Amerra, it contends that ABN AMRO should not be permitted to seek to obtain additional discovery without first demonstrating to the Court that the transaction documents that Amerra has produced to date support what it characterizes as ABN AMRO's careless allegations and furnish specific facts for burdening Amerra with further discovery. See the objection at paragraph 30.

Amerra says that ABN AMRO's right to seek
additional Rule 2004 discovery was conditioned upon its
showing that the discovery provided to date is not
responsive to the document request.

In that regard it notes that the motion does not mention the documents that it is -- that it has produced in response to the Amerra Rule 2004 order, raise any question about the information in those documents, or even indicate that ABN AMRO has received -- has reviewed the documents. See the opposition at -- objection at paragraph 2.

Thus Amerra asserts that the motion is an improper

attempt by ABN AMRO to get discovery from Amerra that is beyond the scope of the Amerra Rule 2004 order.

Moreover, it maintains that there's nothing new in the motion that would justify ABN AMRO's second bite at the apple. See the objection at paragraph 31.

ABN AMRO denies that there has been a bait and switch. It maintains that it is seeking Rule 2004 discovery based on newly discovered information and precisely because Amerra initially objected to producing emails or agreeing to an oral examination. See the reply at paragraph 8.

Further it denies that its request for additional information is an improper end-around the terms of the Amerra Rule 2004 order and contends that through the motion and the Rule 2004 discovery it is seeking information necessary to determine whether claims beneficial to the estate exist against Amerra or any other third party and to determine what really happened to over \$300 million in reported assets that suddenly went missing. See the reply at paragraphs 4 and 6.

ABN AMRO asserts both that Ms. Obler's testimony and documents are unquestionably relevant to such an inquiry and that the discovery is expressly permitted by Rule 2004. See the reply at 4.

It explains that the documents produced to date by third parties in response to the Rule 2004 discovery request

demonstrate that Amerra was more than a mere trading partner and creditor of Euromar and the debtor as Amerra portrays itself. See the reply at 7.

ABN AMRO asserts that in light of this evidence its renewed and more focused request for Rule 2004 discovery from Amerra is exactly the type of additional discovery expressly contemplated by the Amerra Rule 2004 order. See the reply at paragraphs 3 and 8.

The Court notes that the entry of the Amerra Rule 2004 order was expressly "without prejudice to any parties' right to attempt to seek further Rule 2004 discovery from Amerra, and to Amerra's right to attempt to seek Rule 2004 discovery from ABN AMRO or any other lenders or interested parties and without prejudice to Amerra's or ABN AMRO's or any other interested parties' right to object to such further Rule 2004 discovery." See the Amerra Rule 2004 order at page 2.

The Court does not read that reservation of rights language as narrowly as Amerra reads it, and as such does not agree with Amerra that that's a basis for denying the requested relief. Accordingly the Court will consider the merits of the motion.

In relevant part Rule 2004 provides that the Court may authorize the examination of any entity relating to the -- relating "to the acts, conduct, or property, or to the

liabilities and financial condition of the debtor or to any matter which may affect the administration of the debtor's estate." See Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2004(b).

To that end the examination may extend to matters relating "to the operation of any business and to the desirability of its continuation -- continuance, the source of any money or property acquired or to be acquired by the debtor for purposes of consummating a plan, and the consideration given or offered therefore in any other matter relevant to the case or the formulation of a plan." That's Rule 2004(b).

Rule 2004 does not mandate that the Court grant discovery, rather it "provides the Court -- that the Court may order disclosure thereunder giving the Court significant discretion." See In re: Board of Directors of Hopewell International Insurance Ltd., 258 B.R. 580 at 587, Bankruptcy Southern District of New York, 2001.

It is settled that in exercising that discretion the Court must "balance the competing interest of the parties weighing the relevance of and necessity of the information sought by examination. That documents meet the requirement of relevance does not alone demonstrate that there is good cause for requiring their production." In re: Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, Inc., 123 B.R. 702 at 712, Bankruptcy Southern District of New York, 1992.

Courts deny Rule 2004 motions when the "cost and disruption to the examinee attending to the requested examination outweigh the benefits to the examiner." In re: Express One International, Inc., 217 B.R. 215 at 217, Bankruptcy Eastern District of Texas, 1998. See also In re: Sunedison, Inc., 562 B.R. at 249.

The court note the that requests cannot be so broad as to be more disruptive and costly to the examinee than beneficial to the examiner.

Amerra contends that the motion should be denied because the relief sought is unduly burdensome and altogether unnecessary. See the objection at 5.

It asserts that the debtor has produced some 2.6 million pages of documents and that the production appears to include all Transmar emails with Amerra, including those with Ms. Obler and emails between Ms. Obler and Peter B.

Johnson, one of the debtor's principals. See the objection at 5.

It maintains that it should not have to expend what it says will be hundreds of thousands of dollars and enormous resources and time providing internal emails and emails with parties other than Transmar and Euromar because the Court authorized ABN AMRO to take examinations of the debtor's current and former employees and others, and that discovery, coupled with the debtors' mails and files of ABN

AMRO and its lender group, will sufficiently enable ABN AMRO to make whatever arguments it wants to make about the debtor's disclosures, reporting, and decision making or about the debtor's relationship with Amerra. See the objection at 5.

ABN AMRO argues that Amerra's focus on its efforts to obtain deposition testimony from the debtor's former employees is misplaced since most of the witnesses subpoenaed by ABN AMRO has refused to testify on the grounds of their First Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. See the reply at paragraphs 3 and 12.

Moreover, it denies that its request for further Rule 2004 discovery is either unduly burdensome or unnecessary. It asserts that those requests are (1), narrowly tailors; (2), require the electronic search and oral examination of a single Amerra employee; and (3), are not so duly burdensome as to outweigh the benefits to ABN AMRO, the lenders, and other creditors. I

t maintains that the documents produced by the debtor show that Amerra and Ms. Obler's extensive communications concerning the debtors.

As a consequence it asserts that Ms. Obler's testimony, emails, and other documents will provide a primary source of information to determine how and why the debtor misrepresented its financial position and what

Pg 17 of 32

Page 17

happened to the debtor's missing assets. See the reply at paragraph 10.

Further it asserts that to minimize burden on Amerra in responding to the discovery request they have limited the request to require the search of a single custodian's electronic communications, that is the electronic communications (A), between Nancy Obler and any other Amerra officer, director, or employee, or representative concerning the debtor, Euromar, any of their affiliates, or related entities; and (B), between Nancy Obler and any non-debtor third party concerning the debtor, Euromar, and any of their affiliates or any related entities. See the reply at 11.

The Court finds that the requested discovery is unduly burdensome. Not only has ABN AMRO had access to documents produced by the debtor that contained Ms. Obler's emails and other communications between Amerra and the debtor, it is undisputed that throughout 2016 ABN AMRO engaged outside consultants to evaluate Transmar's business, including its financials, the borrowing base inventory, and internal controls.

As ABN AMRO has disclosed at hearings before the Court, two of those advisors were Finance Support Services and RPA Advisors, and both entities had access to the debtor's books and records, systems and procedures, and

employees. Both produced reports to ABN AMRO regarding, among other things, the accuracy of the debtor's borrowing base to be sure the documents and deposition testimony that ABN AMRO is seeking may shed light on the debtor's operations and financial affairs.

However, the Court finds that ABN AMRO already has access to relevant information and that it would be unduly burdensome to Amerra to provide the documents and deposition testimony that ABN AMRO is seeking.

It is settled that in situations like this where the party seeking Rule 2004 discovery has access to the information it is seeking from other sources courts will deny the request for the discovery. See In re: Texaco, 79 B.R. 551 at 553, Bankruptcy Court Southern District of New York, 1989. In re: Duratech Industries, Inc., 241 B.R. 283 at 289 to 90, Eastern District of New York, 1999.

As the party seeking discovery ABN AMRO has the burden of showing good cause for the examination. See in re: Sunedison, Inc., 562 B.R. 243 at 249, Bankruptcy Court Southern District of New York, 2017.

As noted previously by its terms Rule 2004 permits discovery only when it regards the acts, conduct, or property or the liabilities and financial condition of the debtor or to any matter which may affect the administration of the debtor's estate or to the debtor's right to a

Pg 19 of 32

Page 19

discharge.

The underlying purpose of Rule 2004 is to "allow the Court to gain a clear picture of the condition and whereabouts of the bankrupt's estate." King Corp. versus John Mansville Corp., In re: Johns-Manville Corp., 42 B.R. 362 at 364, Southern District of New York, 1984.

Thus "a 2004 examination should only be used for the legitimate purpose of obtaining information to the acts, conduct, or property or to the liabilities and financial condition of the debtor." See In re: Coffee Cupboard, 128 B.R. 509 at 514, Bankruptcy Eastern District of New York, 1991.

Amerra asserts that the motion is nothing more than a transparent attempt by ABN AMRO to obtain a litigation advantage through one-way discovery that should not be countenance under Rule 2004.

It contends that ABN AMRO's counsel has advised

Amerra's counsel in no uncertain terms that ABN AMRO is

looking to file a lawsuit against Amerra. See the objection

at paragraph 6.

It maintains that ABN AMRO has singled it out twice for sweeping Rule 2004 discovery requests, and that in the context of these cases ABN AMRO has received from Amerra the discovery that is appropriate under Rule 2004.

It maintains that any further discovery as to

Amerra should be done in the context of a cause of action against it, if one exists, such that Amerra will have the protections of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the ability to obtain its own reciprocal discovery. See the objection at 6.

ABN AMRO denies that it has determined that it will sue Amerra. Reply at 16.

It contends that investigating the facts, circumstances, and events that resulted in the disappearance of hundreds of millions of dollars in collateral value and other property from the debtor's estate in order to determine whether the lenders, individually, and the debtor's creditors, generally, have viable claims against the parties as a result of the circumstances that resulted in this bankruptcy case. See the reply at 17.

It says that the facts and information that ABN

AMRO and the lenders obtained through the Rule 2004 process

will inure not only to the benefit of the lenders but also

to the benefit of the debtor's estate and its other

creditors. See the reply at paragraph 16.

Thus it asserts that the fact that it may discover through this investigation facts supporting a potential claim against Amerra or any other third party does not preclude it from obtaining the requested discovery. See the reply at 16.

Pursuant to the document request ABN AMRO is seeking, (1), all documents, including emails, text messages, and Bloomberg terminal messages to and from Nancy Obler, including communications in which Nancy Obler was copied as a cc, and any employee concerning the debtor and/or any of the affiliates; and (2), all document, including emails, text messages, and Bloomberg terminal messages to and from Nancy Obler, including communications in which Nancy Obler was copied as a cc, and any person concerning the debtor and/or any of the debtor's affiliates expressly excluding any documents sent to or from the debtor and/or any of the affiliates, including as a cc; and (3), any custodian using the email domain TransmarGroup.com.

The Court agrees with Amerra that the motion is aimed at gathering information relevant to Amerra's actions and connections with the debtors and its role, if any, in advising the debtor in its dealings with the lenders.

ABN AMRO is seeking to confirm not only that

Amerra, through Ms. Obler, was aware of the events and

causes of action that led to the debtor's failure, but that

Amerra played an active role in assisting the debtors in

formulating their strategy for dealing with the lenders. In

that way the focus of the requested discovery is on Amerra,

not the debtors.

It is well settled that Rule 2004 examinations are

not generally permitted once an adversary proceeding has been filed since discovery must be pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See, for example, In re: Bennett Funding Group, Inc., B.R. 24 at 28, Bankruptcy Northern District of New York, 1998, and In re: Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, Inc., 128 B.R. at 711.

No such litigation is pending, nonetheless it's clear to the Court that ABN AMRO has identified Amerra as a litigation target and is seeking to utilize the liberal discovery available under Rule 2004 to further this ultimate litigation. That's not permitted.

See, for example, In re: J&R Trucking, Inc., 431

B.R. 818 at 822 to 823, Bankruptcy for the Northern District

of Indiana, 2010, where the court denied a creditor's Rule

2004 discovery request to identify third parties with

liability as beyond the scope of Rule 2004 and noting that

"no matter how artfully one tries to disguise the requested

examinations by dressing them up in the robes of bankruptcy

administration, their real purpose is to identify another

entity movants might be able to collect from and whether

those efforts would have any impact on the bankruptcy estate

is of no real concern to them."

The Court finds that the information ABN AMRO is seeking from Amerra goes beyond "the acts, conduct, or property, or to the liabilities and financial condition of

Page 23 1 the debtor or to any matter which may affect the 2 administration of the debtor's estate." For this additional 3 reason ABN AMRO is not entitled to Rule 2004 -- the Rule 4 2004 discovery it is seeking from Amerra. 5 Based on the foregoing the Court's denies the 6 motion and so orders the record. 7 Any questions? All right. I think that's everything we had to deal with today; is that right? 8 9 Thank you very much. 10 (A chorus of thank you) 11 (Whereupon, proceedings concluded at 11:38 a.m.) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Page 24 INDEX **RULINGS** DESCRIPTION PAGE Application for FRBP 2004 Examination Motion for an Order Pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure Authorizing ABN AMRO Capital USA LLC to Issue a Subpoena for the Further Production of Documents from and the Oral Examination of AMERRA Capital Management LLC, by Nancy Obler (Doc #255)

Page 25 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Dawn South, certified that the foregoing transcript 4 is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. Digitally signed by Dawn South DN: cn=Dawn South, o=Veritext, ou, email=digital@veritext.com, c=US Date: 2017.06.13 16:30:25 -04'00' 5 Dawn South 6 7 Dawn South AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-408 8 9 10 Date: June 12, 2017 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 Veritext Legal Solutions 23 330 Old Country Road 24 Suite 300 25 Mineola, NY 11501

-	-		
23:2	16:4,16,20 17:4,8	12:20 13:4 15:13	basis 9:20 10:5,18
administrative	17:17 18:8 19:13	16:14,22 17:3	13:20
6:15	19:19,23 20:1,2,7	19:13 20:21	behalf 2:23
advance 8:15	20:23 21:14,19,21	assets 12:18 17:1	beneficial 12:15
advantage 19:15	21:23 22:8,24	assisting 21:21	15:9
adversary 22:1	23:4 24:9	attanasio 5:6	benefit 9:7 20:18
advised 19:17	amerra's 9:17	attempt 12:1	20:19
advising 8:4 21:17	10:5 13:12,14	13:11,12 19:14	benefited 10:11
advisors 17:23,24	16:6 19:18 21:15	attempted 10:21	benefits 15:3
affairs 8:16 18:5	amounts 10:21	attending 15:2	16:17
affect 14:2 18:24	amro 2:3,10,17,25	attorney 4:3,11	bennett 22:3
23:1	3:3 4:18 6:6,14,14	4:18 5:10,17	beyond 8:7 10:23
affidavit 2:22	6:20,25 7:10,11	attorneys 5:2	12:2 22:16,24
affiliate 7:8	7:19,23 8:1,11 9:5	austin 5:1	bit 6:11
affiliates 8:21	9:14,17,18 10:10	authorize 13:24	bite 12:4
17:10,12 21:6,10	10:19,22 11:8,23	authorized 10:24	bloomberg 21:3,7
21:12	12:1,6,20 13:4,13	15:23	board 14:15
agent 6:15,15	15:23 16:1,1,6,9	authorizing 2:3	books 17:25
agree 13:20	16:18 17:15,18,22	2:10,17 3:3 6:20	borrowing 8:25
agreed 7:11	18:1,4,6,9,17	7:19 24:7	17:20 18:2
agreeing 12:9	19:14,18,21,23	available 22:10	bowling 1:15
agreement 6:17	20:6,17 21:1,18	avenue 4:5 5:3	broad 15:8
agrees 21:14	22:8,23 23:3 24:7	aware 21:19	broadway 5:11
aimed 21:15	amro's 9:24 11:7	b	brought 10:22
allegations 10:1	11:12,15 12:4	b 1:23 8:21 14:3	building 5:18
11:13	13:14 19:17	14:11 15:16 17:10	burden 17:3
alleged 9:17	andrew 4:22 5:23	b.r. 14:16,24 15:4	18:18
allow 8:18 19:2	appearances 6:8	15:6 18:14,15,19	burdening 11:13
altogether 15:12	appears 15:14	19:5,11 22:4,6,13	burdensome
amended 6:17,18	apple 12:5	bait 10:21 12:6	15:11 16:13,17
amendment 16:10	application 2:1	balance 14:19	17:15 18:8
amerra 2:5,12,15	24:5	bankrupt's 19:4	burnham 14:24
2:19,23 3:4 5:2	appropriate	bankruptcy 1:1	22:5
6:22,23 7:1,6,9,10	19:24	1:14,25 2:3,10,17	business 8:15 14:5
7:11,14,15,20,21	april 11:5	3:2 6:19 7:19 9:4	17:19
7:23 8:6,7,9,14	argues 10:20 16:6	14:3,17,25 15:5	c
9:11,11,16,19	argument 6:10	18:14,19 19:11	c 2:23 4:1,15 6:1
10:7,11,16,20,24	arguments 6:11	20:15 22:4,13,18	8:25 25:1,1
11:1,1,6,6,8,11,13	16:2	22:21 24:7	capital 2:3,5,10
11:15,21,25 12:1	artfully 22:17	base 8:25 17:20	2:12,15,17,19,23
	1		
12:2,9,13,16 13:1	asserted 10:10	18.3	2.25 3.5 6.14 22
	asserted 10:10 asserts 8:1,11 9:5	18:3 hased 12:8 23:5	2:25 3:5 6:14,22 24:7 10
12:2,9,13,16 13:1		18:3 based 12:8 23:5	2:25 3:5 6:14,22 24:7,10

	1		
careless 11:12	concerning 16:21	counsel 8:6 19:17	19:10 21:5,10,11
case 1:7 6:5 9:4	17:9,11 21:5,10	19:18	21:17 23:1
14:10 20:15	concluded 23:11	countenance	debtor's 8:4,15,19
cases 7:2 8:3	condition 14:1	19:16	8:24 9:2,7 10:12
19:23	18:23 19:3,10	country 25:23	10:12 14:2 15:17
cause 14:23 18:18	22:25	coupled 15:25	15:24 16:3,4,7
20:1	conditioned 11:16	court 1:1,14 6:2,4	17:1,25 18:2,4,25
causes 21:20	conditions 7:13	6:11,13 7:10 8:12	18:25 20:11,13,19
cavaliere 5:14	conduct 13:25	11:10 13:9,18,21	21:10,20 23:2
cc 21:5,9,12	18:22 19:9 22:24	13:23 14:12,13,13	debtors 8:2 15:25
certain 6:21 8:21	conducted 9:9	14:14,19 15:7,23	16:21 21:16,21,24
certified 25:3,8	conferences 7:10	17:14,23 18:6,14	decision 16:3
cet 25:8	confirm 21:18	18:19 19:3 21:14	declaration 2:8
chapter 8:3	connections 21:16	22:8,14,23	demands 9:24
characterizes	consequence	court's 23:5	demonstrate 13:1
8:13 11:12	16:22	courts 15:1 18:12	14:22
chorus 6:3 23:10	consider 6:11	credit 6:17	demonstrating
circumstances	13:21	creditor 13:2	11:10
8:22 9:3 20:9,14	consideration	creditor's 22:14	denatale 4:22
citing 10:14	14:9	creditors 9:2,8,9	denied 10:21
civil 20:3 22:3	conspiracy 10:16	16:18 20:13,20	15:10 22:14
claim 20:23	consultants 17:19	cupboard 19:10	denies 12:6,11
claims 9:2 12:15	consummating	current 15:24	16:12 20:6 23:5
20:13	14:8	custodian 21:13	deny 15:1 18:13
clear 19:3 22:8	contained 17:16	custodian's 17:6	denying 13:20
close 9:19	contemplated	d	department 5:16
cocoa 11:4	13:7		deposition 7:23
coffee 19:10	contended 9:19	d 5:23 6:1 24:1	16:7 18:3,8
collateral 6:15	contends 8:5 11:8	25:8	description 24:4
8:24 9:25 20:10	12:13 15:10 19:17	danzig 4:2	desirability 14:6
collect 22:20	20:8	date 11:11,17	determine 12:15
commencement	context 19:23	12:24 25:10	12:17 16:24 20:12
8:3	20:1	dated 6:17 7:3,20	determined 20:6
committee 5:10	continuance 14:6	dating 7:11	determining 9:1
9:9	continuation 14:6	dawn 3:25 25:3,7	director 6:23 17:8
commodity 1:7	continue 8:18	deal 23:8	directors 14:15
6:4 7:7,8	controls 17:21	dealing 21:22	disappearance
communications	copied 21:5,9	dealings 21:17	8:23 20:9
16:21 17:6,7,17	corneau 4:15	debtor 1:10 4:3	disappeared 10:1
21:4,8	corp 19:4,5,5	4:11 7:6,14,16	discharge 19:1
competing 14:19	cost 15:1	9:18 10:8 13:2	disclosed 17:22
concern 22:22	costly 15:8	14:1,8 15:13	disclosure 14:14
		16:20,25 17:9,11	
		17:11,16,18 18:24	
	X7 '4 4 T	I .	

disclosures 16:3	dressing 22:18	euromar 7:8,8,14	failure 21:20
discover 20:21	drexel 14:24 22:5	7:16 9:20 10:6,13	february 6:18
discovered 9:6	drogin 5:9	13:2 15:22 17:9	7:20
12:8	duly 16:17	17:12	federal 2:2,9,16
discovery 6:7 7:1	duplicative 9:8	evaluate 17:19	3:2 5:18 6:19 7:18
7:5,9,24 8:1,18	duratech 18:15	events 8:22 20:9	14:3 20:3 22:2
9:21,24 10:19,23	e	21:19	24:6
11:8,9,14,16,17	e 1:23,23 4:1,1 6:1	evidence 7:12	file 19:19
12:1,7,14,22,25	6:1 24:1 25:1	13:4	filed 2:22 6:6 22:2
13:5,6,11,13,16	early 9:18	ex 7:2	files 15:25
14:13 15:25 16:13	eastern 15:5	exact 10:1	final 8:16
17:4,14 18:11,13	18:16 19:11	exactly 13:6	finance 17:23
18:17,22 19:15,22	ecf 6:24 7:4,20	examination 2:1,5	financial 14:1
19:24,25 20:4,24	9:12,15	2:12,19 3:4 6:22	16:25 18:5,23
21:23 22:2,10,15	efforts 16:6 22:21	8:8,14 12:10	19:9 22:25
23:4	either 16:13	13:24 14:4,21	financials 17:20
discretion 14:15		15:3 16:16 18:18	finds 17:14 18:6
14:18	electronic 16:15	19:7 24:5,9	22:23
disguise 22:17	17:6,7 25:8	examinations	first 7:4 10:2,5,9
disruption 15:2	email 21:13	15:23 21:25 22:18	10:14 11:10 16:10
disruptive 15:8	emails 9:21 12:9	examinee 15:2,8	floor 4:12
district 1:2 14:17	15:15,16,21,22	examiner 15:3,9	focus 16:6 21:23
14:25 15:5 18:14	16:23 17:17 21:2	example 22:3,12	focused 13:5
18:16,20 19:6,11	21:7	excluding 21:11	foregoing 23:5
22:5,13	employee 16:16	exercising 14:18	25:3
doc 2:6,13,20 3:5	17:8 21:5	exist 12:16	former 15:24 16:7
24:10	employees 15:24	exists 20:2	formulating 21:22
document 3:4	16:8 18:1	expend 15:19	formulation 14:10
6:24 7:21 9:12,15	enable 16:1	expense 10:11	forward 10:22
11:18 21:1,6	engaged 17:19	explains 12:24	frbp 2:1 24:5
documentation	enormous 15:21	express 15:4	fundamental 10:4
10:7	entirety 11:4	expressly 12:22	funding 22:4
documents 2:4,12	entities 17:10,13	13:7,10 21:11	funds 10:8
2:19 6:21 7:11,17	17:24	extend 14:4	furnish 11:13
8:7,14 11:2,11,20	entitled 23:3	extensive 16:20	further 2:4,11,18
11:22,23 12:21,24	entity 13:24 22:20	extent 10:10	3:1,3 11:7,14
14:21 15:14 16:19	entry 6:18 13:9	extracting 10:7	12:11 13:11,16
16:23 17:16 18:3	esq 4:8,15,22 5:6	f	16:12 17:3 19:25
18:8 21:2,11 24:9	5:7,14,23	_	22:10 24:8
dollars 8:23 9:25	estate 8:24 9:7	f 1:23 25:1	g
15:20 20:10	10:12 12:16 14:3	fact 7:17 20:21	
domain 21:13	18:25 19:4 20:11	facts 7:13 8:22 9:3	g 2:22 5:7 6:1
	20:19 22:21 23:2	9:6 11:13 20:8,16	gain 19:3
		20:22	
	X7 '4 4 T		

Г	T		
garrity 1:24	incrimination	johnson 15:17	little 6:11
gathering 21:15	16:11	joseph 4:8,15	llc 2:3,6,11,13,15
generally 9:2	indiana 22:14	judge 1:25	2:18,20,23 3:5
10:12 20:13 22:1	indicate 11:22	june 1:18 25:10	6:14,22 24:8,10
give 6:10	individually 9:1	jureller 4:10	llcs 2:25
given 14:9	20:12	justice 5:16	llp 4:2,10,17 5:1
giving 14:14	industries 18:15	justify 12:4	locate 9:25
gmbh 7:8	information 9:6	k	looking 19:19
goes 22:24	10:22 11:22 12:8	kenneth 2:8	m
good 6:2,3 14:23	12:12,14 14:21	king 19:4	maiden 4:19
18:18	16:24 18:7,12	klestadt 4:10	mails 15:25
grand 10:16	19:8 20:16 21:15	krinsky 5:9	maintains 8:12,17
grant 8:12 14:12	22:23	1	9:16 10:4,18 12:3
green 1:15	initially 12:9	_	12:7 15:19 16:19
grounds 16:9	inquiry 12:21	1 1:24 4:8	19:21,25
group 1:7 6:4 7:7	insurance 14:16	labels 10:16	making 16:3
14:24 16:1 22:4,6	interest 14:19	lambert 14:24	management 2:5
h	interested 13:13	22:6	2:13,15,20,23 3:5
happened 12:17	13:15	lane 4:19	6:22 8:4 24:10
17:1	internal 15:21	language 13:19	managing 6:23
headquarters 4:4	17:21	lavan 4:17	mandate 14:12
hearing 2:1,8,15	international	lawsuit 19:19	mansville 19:5
2:22,25 6:5	14:16 15:4	leading 8:2 learned 8:2	manville 19:5
hearings 17:22	inure 9:7 20:18		matter 1:5 6:13
hon 1:24	inventory 17:20	learning 8:5 led 21:20	10:20 14:2,9
hopewell 14:15	investigate 8:19	lee 5:6	18:24 22:17 23:1
hundreds 8:23	8:21	leg 11:3	matters 7:24 14:4
9:25 15:20 20:10	investigating 20:8	legal 25:22	means 9:24
hutchinson 2:22	investigation 8:15	legitimate 19:8	meet 14:21
2:23 5:7	9:5,8 10:14 20:22	lender 16:1	mention 11:20
hyland 4:2	involving 7:16	lenders 6:16,16	mere 13:1
i	issue 2:4,11,18 3:3 6:20 7:19 24:8	9:1 10:11 13:13	merits 13:22
identified 22:8		16:18 20:12,17,18	messages 21:3,3,7
identify 22:15,19	j	21:17,22	21:8
impact 22:21	j&r 22:12	liabilities 14:1	meticulously 11:2
improper 10:6	james 1:24	18:23 19:9 22:25	million 12:17
11:25 12:12	january 7:3,12	liability 22:16	15:14
include 15:15	9:18	liberal 22:9	millions 8:23 9:25
including 8:20	jlg 1:7	light 13:4 18:4	20:10
9:21 11:3 15:15	john 2:22,22 5:7	limited 8:13,20	mineola 25:25
17:20 21:2,4,7,8	19:5	17:5	minimize 17:3
21:12	johns 19:5	litigation 19:15	misplaced 16:8
		22:7,9,11	
	1		

	I	T.	1
misrepresented	noting 22:16	order 2:2,9,16 3:1	plan 14:8,10
16:25	number 6:5	6:18 7:18,22 8:7	played 8:3 21:21
missing 12:18	ny 4:13,20 5:4,12	8:15 10:24 11:2,7	plaza 4:4
17:1	5:21 25:25	11:21 12:2,13	portrays 9:24
money 14:7	0	13:7,10,17 14:14	13:2
months 8:2	o 1:23 6:1 25:1	20:11 24:6	position 16:25
morning 6:2,3	oath 8:8	ordered 7:24	possesses 7:17
morristown 4:6	object 13:15	orders 23:6	potential 20:22
motion 2:1,9,16	objected 7:9,23	organized 11:3	precisely 12:8
2:25 3:1 6:6,13	12:9	outset 7:2	preclude 20:24
7:3,4,25 8:9,12,16		outside 17:19	prejudice 13:10
9:4,9,11,23 10:2,5	objection 2:15	outweigh 15:3	13:14
10:10,15,19,20	9:12,12,14,22	16:17	preliminary
11:19,25 12:4,13	10:2,8,14,17,24	р	10:20
13:22 15:10 19:13	11:14,24 12:5		prepared 6:12
21:14 23:6 24:5	15:12,17 16:5	p 4:1,1 6:1	present 7:12
motions 15:1	19:19 20:5	page 13:17 24:4	preserved 11:7
movants 22:20	obler 2:6,13,20	pages 15:14	previously 18:21
n	3:5 6:23 8:3,8	paragraph 8:10	primary 16:24
	15:16,16 17:7,11	9:22 10:15,25	principals 15:17
n 4:1 6:1 24:1	21:4,4,8,9,19	11:14,24 12:5,10	privilege 16:10
25:1	24:10	17:2 19:20 20:20	procedure 2:3,10
nancy 2:6,13,20	obler's 8:14 12:20	paragraphs 12:19	2:17 3:2 6:20 7:19
3:5 6:23 17:7,10	16:20,22 17:16	13:8 16:11	14:3 20:3 22:3
21:3,4,8,9 24:10	obtain 11:9 16:7	part 7:15 13:23	24:7
narrowly 13:19	19:14 20:4	parte 7:2	procedures 17:25
16:15	obtained 8:1	parties 8:21 9:3	proceeding 22:1
necessary 12:15	20:17	12:25 13:10,14,15	proceedings
necessity 14:20	obtaining 7:23	14:20 15:22 20:14	23:11 25:4
need 6:8 8:11	19:8 20:24	22:15	process 20:17
new 1:2,16,16	offered 14:9	partner 13:1	processes 8:19
4:13,20 5:4,12,21	office 5:18	party 7:15 12:16	produce 7:11 8:6
9:16,24 10:22	officer 17:8	17:11 18:11,17	8:8
12:3 14:17,25	old 25:23	20:23	produced 11:4,11
18:14,16,20 19:6	once 22:1	pasquale 2:8	11:20 12:24 15:13
19:11 22:5	operation 14:5	pending 22:7	16:19 17:16 18:1
newly 12:8	operations 8:20	permits 18:21	producing 12:9
nj 4:6	18:5	permitted 11:9	production 2:4,11
non 17:11	opposes 9:11	12:22 22:1,11	2:18 3:4 6:21
northern 22:4,13	opposition 11:24	perretti 4:2	14:23 15:14 24:8
note 15:7	oral 2:5,12,19 3:4	person 21:9	property 8:24
noted 18:21	6:21 8:14 12:10	peter 15:16	13:25 14:7 18:23
notes 10:9 11:19	16:16 24:9	picture 19:3	19:9 20:11 22:25
13:9			17.7 20.11 22.23
		I	1

[protections - sought]			
protections 20:3	relating 13:24,25	responsive 11:18	schwartz 4:8
provide 16:23	14:5	restated 6:17	scope 8:7 10:23
18:8	relationship 9:17	result 9:3,6 10:12	12:2 22:16
provided 7:14	9:20 10:13 16:4	20:14	search 16:15 17:5
11:2,17	relevance 14:20	resulted 8:22 9:4	second 6:25 12:4
provides 13:23	14:22	20:9,14	secured 6:16
14:13	relevant 12:21	reviewed 11:23	see 6:24 7:18 8:9
providing 15:21	13:23 14:10 18:7	right 6:2 7:6 11:7	9:4,9,11,15,21
purpose 19:2,8	21:15	11:15 13:11,12,15	10:2,8,24 11:14
22:19	relief 13:21 15:11	18:25 23:7,8	11:24 12:5,10,18
purposes 14:8	renewed 13:5	rights 13:18	12:23 13:3,7,16
pursuant 2:2,9,16	reply 2:25,25 9:14	riker 4:2	14:3,15 15:5,12
3:1 6:19 7:18 21:1	12:10,18,23 13:3	ripe 10:13	15:17 16:4,11
22:2 24:6	13:8 16:11 17:1	rivera 5:23	17:1,13 18:13,18
q	17:13 20:7,15,20	road 25:23	19:10,19 20:4,15
question 11:21	20:25	robes 22:18	20:20,24 22:3,12
question 11.21 questions 23:7	reported 12:18	rocco 5:14	seek 11:7,9,15
	reporting 16:3	role 8:4,5 21:16	13:11,12
r	reports 8:25 18:1	21:21	seeking 6:6 10:19
r 1:23 4:1 6:1 25:1	representative	rpa 17:24	10:23 12:7,14
raise 11:21	17:9	rule 2:2,9,16 3:2	18:4,9,11,12,17
ranging 9:21	request 8:9 11:18	6:6,12,19 7:1,4,18	21:2,18 22:9,24
read 13:18	12:11,25 13:5	7:21 8:7 10:2,5,9	23:4
reads 13:19	16:12 17:4,5	10:15,24 11:1,6,7	self 16:10
real 22:19,22	18:13 21:1 22:15	11:16,21 12:2,7	sent 21:11
really 12:17	requested 8:6,17	12:13,14,22,25	separate 11:3
reason 23:3	8:18 13:21 15:2	13:5,7,9,11,12,16	services 17:23
received 11:23	17:14 20:24 21:23	13:16,23 14:3,11	settled 14:18
19:23	22:17	14:12 15:1 16:13	18:10 21:25
reciprocal 20:4	requests 15:7	18:11,21 19:2,16	seventh 5:3
record 23:6 25:4	16:14 19:22	19:22,24 20:17	shed 18:4
recordkeeping	require 16:15	21:25 22:10,14,16	show 10:7 16:20
8:19	17:5	23:3,3 24:6	showing 11:17
records 17:25	requirement	rules 2:2,10,17	18:18
refer 6:14,16,23	14:22	3:2 6:19 7:19 20:3	sidley 5:1
7:3,21	requires 8:13	22:3 24:6	significant 14:14
referred 9:12	requiring 14:23	rulings 24:3	single 16:16 17:5
reflected 8:25	reservation 13:18	S	singled 19:21
refused 8:9 16:9	resources 15:21	s 4:1 5:6 6:1	situations 18:10
regard 11:19	respect 7:5	says 11:15 15:20	solutions 25:22
regarding 18:1	responding 17:4	20:16	sought 6:25 7:4
regards 18:22	response 11:1,21	scherer 4:2	9:21 14:21 15:11
related 7:16 17:10	12:25		
17:12			

[source - york] Page 8

source 14:6 16:24	towning 21.2 7	trustee 5:17	witnesses 16:8
sources 14.0 10.24 sources 18:12	terminal 21:3,7 terms 7:13 12:12	twice 19:22	
south 3:25 25:3,7	18:21 19:18	twice 19.22 two 17:23	X
south 3.23 23.3,7 southard 4:10	testify 16:9	type 13:6	x 1:3,12 24:1
southern 1:2	testiny 10.9 testimony 12:20		y
14:17,25 18:14,20	16:7,23 18:3,9	u	york 1:2,16,16
19:6	texaco 18:13	u.s. 1:25 5:16,17	4:13,20 5:4,12,21
special 9:17	texas 15:5	5:18	14:17,25 18:15,16
specific 11:13	text 21:2,7	ultimate 22:10	18:20 19:6,11
speedwell 4:5	thank 6:9 23:9,10	uncertain 19:18	22:5
states 1:1,14	theory 10:17	underlying 19:2	22.3
states 1.1,14 stevens 4:10	thereof 9:6	undisputed 17:18	
strategy 21:22	thereunder 14:14	unduly 15:11	
strategy 21.22 street 4:12 5:19	things 7:5,25 18:2	16:13 17:15 18:7	
stroock 4:17,17	think 23:7	unique 9:19	
submitted 9:14	third 8:21 12:16	uniquely 9:19	
submitted 5.14 subpoena 2:4,11	12:25 17:11 20:23	united 1:1,14	
2:18 3:3 6:20 24:8	22:15	unnecessary	
subpoenaed 16:9	thousands 15:20	15:12 16:14	
subpoenas 7:20	time 6:11,25	unquestionably	
suddenly 12:18	15:21	12:21	
sue 20:7	today 23:8	urgent 8:11	
sufficient 7:12	trading 13:1	usa 2:3,11,18,25	
sufficiently 16:1	transaction 7:15	6:14 24:7	
suite 5:20 25:24	7:16 11:3,11	utilize 22:9	
sunedison 15:6	transactions 7:6	V	
18:19	7:13 8:20 10:6,13	value 8:24 20:10	
support 2:8 3:1	11:4	varick 5:19	
7:25 10:2,9 11:12	transcribed 3:25	velez 5:23	
17:23	transcriber 25:8	veritext 25:22	
supporting 20:22	transcript 25:3	versus 19:4	
sure 18:3	transmar 1:7 6:4	viable 9:2 20:13	
sweeping 19:22	7:7,7 9:20 10:6	voluntarily 8:6,8	
switch 10:21 12:7	15:15,22	W	
systems 17:25	transmar's 7:7	wants 16:2	
t	17:19	way 19:15 21:23	
t 16:19 25:1,1	transmargroup.c	weighing 14:20	
tailors 16:15	21:13	went 12:18	
take 6:8 15:23	transparent 19:14	west 4:12	
target 22:9	tries 22:17	whereabouts 19:4	
tarter 5:9	trucking 22:12	wide 9:21	
team 8:4	true 25:4	winters 4:10	
0.1			